

Appln No. 10/760,231
Amdt. Dated March 14, 2006
Response to Final Office Action of May 23, 2006

2

Examiner is also asserting that the printhead modules 12 of Silverbrook equate to the claimed printhead module since element "28" is an element of the printhead modules 12.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that based on the disclosure of Silverbrook only one or the other of 'element 10' and 'element 12' of Silverbrook can be considered to be a printhead module, not both interchangeably so as to meet the claimed limitations. Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted (for at least the reasons discussed below) that:

(i) if elements 10 and 12 are considered separately, not all of the claimed limitations are met; and

(ii) even if elements 10 and 12 are improperly considered interchangeably in the manner asserted by the Examiner, not all of the claimed limitations are met.

Regarding (i)

If element 12 is considered to alone equate to the claimed printhead module, then Silverbrook does not disclose or suggest arranging each printhead module 12 with "at least two printhead integrated circuits", as is required by pending independent claim 1 and as is admitted by the Examiner, such that not all of the claimed limitations are met.

On the other hand, if element 10 is considered to alone equate to the claimed printhead module, then Silverbrook does not disclose or suggest a "casing" which is separate from the printhead assembly 10, as is required by pending independent claim 1. This is because, the chassis 14 of Silverbrook, asserted by the Examiner as constituting the casing of the claimed invention, are clearly disclosed by Silverbrook as being part of the printhead assembly 10 itself (see col. 2, lines 6-8 and col. 3, lines 45-65 of Silverbrook).

Accordingly, if the printhead assembly 10 is considered to be the printhead module of the claimed invention, further disclosure of a casing (the only disclosure in Silverbrook being that the chassis 14 can be customised for printhead mounting at col. 5, lines 33-35), is not provided in Silverbrook, such that not all of the claimed limitations are met.

Regarding (ii)

If elements 10 and 12 are improperly considered interchangeably in the manner asserted by the Examiner, then there is still no disclosure or suggestion from Silverbrook of a "casing" which are separate from the printhead module 10/12, as is required by pending independent claim 1.

That is, either the chassis 14 of the printhead assembly 10 of Silverbrook is considered as the claimed "casing" which mounts the printhead modules 12 via the ink reservoir 16 (see col. 2, lines 6-16 of Silverbrook), in which case the printhead modules 12 must be considered to equate to the claimed "printhead module" such that only a single chip 18 is disclosed per printhead module, contrary to the claimed invention, OR the chassis 14 of the printhead assembly 10 is considered as the claimed "support member", in which case the printhead assembly 10 must be considered to equate to the claimed "printhead module" such that an external casing is not disclosed or suggested.

Appln No. 10/760,231
Amdt. Dated March 14, 2006
Response to Final Office Action of May 23, 2006

3

Thus, there is no interpretation of the disclosure of Silverbrook which can yield the claimed invention. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of pending claims 1-7 is not disclosed or suggested by Silverbrook.


It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's rejections have been traversed. Accordingly, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Very respectfully,

Applicants:



KIA SILVERBROOK



NORMAN MICHEAL BERRY



GARRY RAYMOND JACKSON



AKIRA NAKAZAWA

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia
Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com
Telephone: +612 9818 6633
Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762